



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,404	02/06/2001	Dimitri Kanevsky	13952 (YOR92000664US1)	4539

7590 10/22/2002

Richard L. Catania  
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/777,404	KANEVSKY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Leonid Shapiro	2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                           | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

*Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claim 6 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Since the holes are punched through specifications and claims, making harder to read, and scan when the case is allowed, please resubmit "specifications" and "claims".

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

3. Claims 1-5, 8-9, 19-23, 26-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zamojdo et al. (US Patent No. 6,272,431 B1).

As to claim 1, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system for a vehicle with an optical arrangement installed on at least one transparent viewing surface for a driver of the vehicle,

optical arrangement representing images displayed on one viewing surface producing guiding images for imparting directions to the driver (See Fig. 3, 4, item 625, in description See Col. 3, Lines 13-14 and 31-37).

As to claim 19, Zamojdo et al. teaches a method for navigational of a vehicle with an optical arrangement installed on at least one transparent viewing surface for a driver of the vehicle, optical arrangement representing images displayed on one viewing surface producing guiding images for imparting directions to the driver (See Fig. 3, 4, item 621, in description See Col. 3, Lines 13-14 and 31-37).

As to claim 2, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system, wherein images have graphic representation pointing toward objects observed by the driver (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, Lines 31-37).

As to claim 20, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational method, wherein images have graphic representation pointing toward objects observed by the driver (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, Lines 31-37).

As to claim 3, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system, wherein graphical representations comprise an image of at least one arrow display on at least one viewing surface pointing towards a selected object for guiding the driver in a specified direction of travel (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, Lines 31-37).

As to claim 21, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational method, wherein graphical representations comprise an image of at least one arrow display on at least one viewing surface pointing towards a selected object for guiding the driver in a specified direction of travel (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, Lines 31-37).

As to claim 4, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system, wherein at least one arrow is projected on at least one viewing surface so as to be perceived in a 3-dimentional spatial image (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, Lines 31-37).

As to claim 22, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational method, wherein at least one arrow is projected on at least one viewing surface so as to be perceived in a 3-dimentional spatial image (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, Lines 31-37).

As to claim 5, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system, wherein at least one viewing surface comprises the windshield of automobile vehicle (See Fig. 3, 4, item 16, in description See Col. 3, Lines 13-14).

As to claim 23, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system, wherein at least one viewing surface comprises the windshield of automobile vehicle (See Fig. 3, 4, item 16, in description See Col. 3, Lines 13-14).

As to claim 8, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system, wherein at least one viewing surface comprises lenses of optical arrangement having at least one arrow provided thereon, lenses having regulatable degrees of curvature and through which there are displayed objects located exteriorly of vehicle, lens curvatures facilitating the 3-dimentional spatial image perception (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 1, Lines 23-30).

As to claim 26, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational method, wherein at least one viewing surface comprises lenses of optical arrangement having at least one arrow provided thereon, lenses having regulatable degrees of curvature and through which there are displayed objects located exteriorly of vehicle, lens curvatures facilitating the 3-dimentional spatial image perception (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 1, Lines 23-30).

As to claim 9, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system, wherein system comprises means to assist drivers of the vehicle having reading disabilities and restrictions to read the names of objects and streets displayed on at least one viewing surface (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 1, Lines 40-42).

As to claim 27, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational method, wherein system comprises means to assist drivers of the vehicle having reading disabilities and restrictions to read the names of objects and streets displayed on at least one viewing surface (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 1, Lines 40-42).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6, 24, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al. as aforementioned in claims 1, 19.

As to claim 6, Zamojdo et al. does not teach a navigational system, wherein at least one viewing surface comprises a side front window of an automobile vehicle.

Since the criticality of the placing the image on a side window was not showing in the specifications or drawings such placement would have been considered as an obvious variation on the matter of selecting the viewing surface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to place the image on the side front window in the Zamojdo et al. apparatus in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

As to claim 24, Zamojdo et al. does not teach a navigational method, wherein at least one viewing surface comprises a side front window of an automobile vehicle.

Since the criticality of the placing the image on a side window was not showing in the specifications or drawings such placement would have been considered as an obvious variation on the matter of selecting the viewing surface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place the image on the side front window in the Zamojdo et al. method in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

5. Claims 7, 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al. as aforementioned in claims 1, 19 in view of Schoolman (US Patent No. 5,281,957), sited by the applicant.

As to claim 7, Zamojdo et al. does not teach viewing surface comprises eyeglasses worn by the driver of the vehicle.

Schoolman teaches the display constructed in a manner similar to a pair of eyeglasses but with the liquid crystal display screens replacing or forming a portion of the eyeglasses lenses (See Fig. 4-5, items 21, 35, in description See Col. 5, Lines 37-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the pair of eyeglasses as shown by Schoolman in the Zamojdo et al. apparatus in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

As to claim 25, Zamojdo et al. does not teach viewing surface comprises eyeglasses worn by the driver of the vehicle.

Schoolman teaches the display constructed in a manner similar to a pair of eyeglasses but with the liquid crystal display screens replacing or forming a portion of the eyeglasses lenses (See Fig. 4-5, items 21, 35, in description See Col. 5, Lines 37-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the pair of eyeglasses as shown by Schoolman in the Zamojdo et al. method in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

6. Claims 10-12, 28-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al. as aforementioned in claims 3, 21 in view of Breed et al. (US Patent No. 6,405,132 B1).

As to claim 10, Zamojdo et al. does not teach a navigational system, wherein system comprises means to assist drivers of the vehicle to recognize the colors of traffic lights as displayed on at least one viewing surface.

Breed et al teaches the system which will emit a signal indicating its color (See Fig. 14, item 180, in description Col.14, Lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the system as shown by Breed et al. in the Zamojdo et al. apparatus in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

As to claim 28, Zamojdo et al. does not teach a navigational method, wherein system comprises means to assist drivers of the vehicle to recognize the colors of traffic lights as displayed on at least one viewing surface.

Breed et al teaches the system which will emit a signal indicating its color (See Fig. 14, item 180, in description Col.14, Lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the system as shown by Breed et al. in the Zamojdo et al. method in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

As to claim 11, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system regarding objects observed on at least one viewing surface and as indicated by the driver by pointing to the objects with pointing means.

Zamojdo et al. does not teach a navigational system, wherein system is in operative communications with a global positioning system.

Breed et al teaches the system and method for preventing vehicle accidents in which GPS ranging signals received (See Fig. 4-5, items 48, 46, in description See Col. 69, Lines 50-67 and Col. 70, Lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the system as shown by Breed et al. in the Zamojdo et al. system in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

As to claim 29, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational method regarding objects observed on at least one viewing surface and as indicated by the driver by pointing to the objects with pointing means.

Zamojdo et al. does not teach a navigational method, wherein system is in operative communications with a global positioning system.

Breed et al teaches the system and method for preventing vehicle accidents in which GPS ranging signals received (See Fig. 4-5, items 48, 46, in description See Col. 69, Lines 50-67 and Col. 70, Lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to use the method as shown by Breed et al. in the Zamojdo et al. method in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

As to claim 12, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational system, wherein pointing means comprise at least one arrow (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, lines 31-37).

As to claim 30, Zamojdo et al. teaches a navigational method, wherein pointing means comprise at least one arrow (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, lines 31-37).

7. Claims 13-16, 31-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al. and Breed et al. as aforementioned in claims 11, 29 in view of Walker et al. (US Patent No. 6,199,014 B1).

As to claim 13-16, Zamojdo et al. and Breed et al. teach a navigational system, wherein a computer is operatively connected to system for operating at least one arrow (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, Lines 31-37).

Zamojdo et al. and Breed et al. do not show means for inputting information to computer by the driver (by microphone or keyboard), computer including means for information displayed on at least one viewing surface while communicating with global positioning system, and imparting directional instructions to driver (by loudspeaker) in response to processing of items of information.

Walker et al. shows means for inputting information to computer by the driver (by microphone or keyboard), computer including means for information displayed on at least one viewing surface while communicating with global positioning system, and imparting directional instructions to driver (by loudspeaker) in response to processing of items of information (See

Fig. 3, items 301-305, 310, 320, in description See Col. 6, Lines 3-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the approach as shown by Walker et al. in the Zamojdo et al. and Breed et al. system in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

As to claim 31-34, Zamojdo et al. and Breed et al. teach a navigational method, wherein a computer is operatively connected to system for operating at least one arrow (See Fig. 3, item 621, in description See Col. 3, Lines 31-37).

Zamojdo et al. and Breed et al. do not show means for inputting information to computer by the driver (by microphone or keyboard), computer including means for information displayed on at least one viewing surface while communicating with global positioning system, and imparting directional instructions to driver (by loudspeaker) in response to processing of items of information.

Walker et al. shows means for inputting information to computer by the driver (by microphone or keyboard), computer including means for information displayed on at least one viewing surface while communicating with global positioning system, and imparting directional instructions to driver (by loudspeaker) in response to processing of items of information (See Fig. 3, items 301-305, 310, 320, in description See Col. 6, Lines 3-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the approach as shown by Walker et al. in the Zamojdo et al. and Breed et al. method in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

8. Claim 17-18, 35-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al., Breed et al. and Walker et al. as aforementioned in claims 13, 31.

As to claims 17-18, Walker et al. teach control means (mouse) as input device (See Fig. 3, item 310, in description See Col. 6, Line17).

Zamojdo et al., Breed et al. and Walker et al. do not teach about a mouse mounted on the steering wheel.

Since the criticality of the placing the mouse on the steering wheel was not showing in the specifications or drawings such placement would have been considered as an obvious variation on the matter of selecting the mounting item. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place the mouse on the steering wheel in the Zamojdo et al., Breed et al. and Walker et al. apparatus in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

As to claims 35-36, Walker et al. teach control means (mouse) as input device (See Fig. 3, item 310, in description See Col. 6, Line17).

Zamojdo et al., Breed et al. and Walker et al. do not teach about a mouse mounted on the steering wheel.

Since the criticality of the placing the mouse on the steering wheel was not showing in the specifications or drawings such placement would have been considered as an obvious variation on the matter of selecting the mounting item. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place the mouse on the steering wheel in the Zamojdo et al., Breed et al. and Walker et al. method in order to increase the range of applications for the navigation system.

*Conclusion*

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

The Nonaka et al. (US Patent 6,212,472 B1) reference discloses method and apparatus for displaying current vehicle position.

The Nakai et al. (US Patent 6,157,890) reference discloses motorcycle navigation system.

The Suman et al. (US Patent 5, 469,298) reference discloses reflective display at infinity.

The Oikawa et al. (US Patent 5,504,622) reference discloses apparatus for head up display composing a parabolic reflective mirror.

The Knoll et al. (US Patent 5,422,812) reference discloses enroute vehicle guidance system with head up display.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 703-305-5661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

Application/Control Number: 09/777,404  
Art Unit: 2673

Page 13

ls  
October 18, 2002



BIPIN SHALWALA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
\*\* CENTER 2600